
Appendix A

Analysis of Scoping Comments

AVISTA Buried Electrical Lines Project

Three letters specific to the project were received during the scoping period of May 27, 2016 to June 27, 2016. The letters were analyzed and an analysis code assigned to the comments (see Table 1).

Comment Analysis Codes

- 1: Outside the scope of the proposed action.
- 2: Already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level of decision.
- 3: Irrelevant to the decision to be made.
- 4: Conjectural and not supported by scientific evidence.
- 5: General comment, suggestion, opinion, or position statement.
- 6: Other agency or partner's consultation, review, advice, recommendation(s), etc.
- 7: Already considered in the proposed action or is standard procedure.
- 8: Will be included in an analysis of effects to the environment.

Codes 1 – 6 are standard codes. Comments assigned to these codes are considered to be non-significant issues. Code 7 was added as a category for those suggestions that are already proposed or for procedures that are routinely done. Code 8 was added as a category for suggestions that will be analyzed for effects to the environment.

Table 1: Comment Analysis

Commenter	Comment	Disposition
Gary Mcfarlane Friends of the Clearwater	Expanding electrical service to a remote area along the 222D, to facilitate summer home development in an area that had almost none of this about 20 years ago, would seem to require more than a simple CE.	We have determined no extraordinary circumstances exist (36 CFR 220.6), and therefore the use of a CE is appropriate for this project.
	Will future lines be needed, or above ground lines, assuming the former mining claims are further developed for second homes?	Any future lines would go through the NEPA process if and when proposed.
	[W]hat are the cumulative impacts and connected actions of one mile of line?	Cumulative effects of the proposed action will be evaluated.
	What about increased sedimentation from use of the 222D road that developing infrastructure in this remote area would engender?	Analyzing the effects from increased use of the road due to potential development of the area is beyond the scope of the action.

Appendix A / Analysis of Scoping Comments / AVISTA Buried Electrical Lines Project

Commenter	Comment	Disposition
Gary Mcfarlane Friends of the Clearwater	These questions cast doubt on whether a CE is sufficient.	We have determined no extraordinary circumstances exist (36 CFR 220.6), and therefore the use of a CE is appropriate for this project.
Jonathan Oppenheimer and Mackenzie Case, Idaho Conservation League	With regards to the AVISTA Buried Electrical Lines (Red River Ranger District (RD) project we do not have any major concerns.	Thank you for your comment.
	Analyses for each project should consider how the project is consistent with various management directions, including but not limited to the Endangered Species Act, Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forest Plans, Clean Water Act and any other relevant laws and agency direction.	Determining consistency with relevant laws, acts, agency direction, etc. is standard procedure for all projects.
Daniel Stewart Idaho Dept. of Env. Quality	Project activities may affect the NP-CW NF's ability to achieve flow based on pollutant allocation reduction associated with Forest land or management activities.	Preliminary Assessment and Inspection Report data (DEQ 2011) show surface waters downstream of the project's affected area within federal water quality standards. The proposed activities would not change the existing condition of these waters.
	Projects initiated after the establishment of TMDL pollutant load allocations can adversely affect water quality through a reduction in load capacity.	
	Project activities may affect the NP-CW NF's ability to support designated and existing beneficial uses.	